

### United States Patent and Trademark Office



(a

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILI	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/534,433	03	/23/2000	David L. Patton	80521F-P	1516	
1333	7590	02/15/2002				
PATENT LEGAL STAFF EASTMAN KODAK COMPANY 343 STATE STREET ROCHESTER, NY 14650-2201				EXAMI	EXAMINER	
				HENDERSO	HENDERSON, MARK T	
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				3722		
				DATE MAILED: 02/15/2002		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Applicant

Application No. 09/534,433

Applicant(s)

David L. Patton

Office Action Summary

Examiner

Mark T. Henderson

rt Unit 3722

	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
A SHO	or Reply DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	
aft - If the	er SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days considered timely	, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will
- If NO co - Failur - Any r	period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory permunication.  The to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by	period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
Status	mod patont torm dejudinent Coo of Control of the	•
1) 💢	Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jan 23, 2	002
2a) 🗌	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) 💢 This act	ion is non-final.
3) 🗆	Since this application is in condition for allowance eclosed in accordance with the practice under ${\it Ex\ pa}$	except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is rte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
Disposi	tion of Claims	
4) 💢	Claim(s) 12-15, 18-26, and 29-33	is/are pending in the application.
4	a) Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) 🗆	Claim(s)	is/are allowed.
6) 💢	Claim(s) 12-14, 18-25, and 29-33	is/are rejected.
7) 💢	Claim(s) 15 and 26	is/are objected to.
8) 🗆	Claims	are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.
Applica	tion Papers	
9) 🗆	The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	
10)□	The drawing(s) filed on is/are	
11)□	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) □ approved b) □ disapproved.
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exam	iner.
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119	
13) 🗆	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign p	riority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
a) [	☐ All b)☐ Some* c)☐ None of:	
	1. $\square$ Certified copies of the priority documents have	ve been received.
	2. $\square$ Certified copies of the priority documents have	
	<ol> <li>Copies of the certified copies of the priority d application from the International Bure ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of th</li> </ol>	
14) 🗆	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	
Attachm	nantis)	
	otice of References Cited (PTO-892)	18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).
, ,	otice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	19) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	nformation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	20) Other:

Art Unit: 3722

**DETAILED ACTION** 

Faxing of Responses to Office Actions

In order to reduce pendency and avoid potential delays, TC 3700 is encouraging

FAXING of responses to Office Actions directly into the Group at (703)872-9302 (Official) and

(703)872-9303 (for After Finals). This practice may be used for filing papers which require a fee

by applicants who authorize charges to a PTO deposit account. Please identify the examiner and

art unit at the top of your cover sheet. Papers submitted via FAX into TC 3700 will be promptly

forwarded to the examiner.

1. Claims 16, 17, 27 and 28 have been canceled. Claims 12, 18, 23 and 29 have been

amended for further examination.

Art Unit: 3722

## Specification

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. Claims are not directed to a "method for printing and verifying". Claims disclose a limited edition stamp product.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

3. Claim 12 recites the limitation "said limited edition stamps" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Should this be "stamp"?

Art Unit: 3722

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

4. Claims 12, 14, 18, 23, 25 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Gasper et al (5,919,730).

Gasper et al discloses in Fig. 1 and 1A, a document (10, which could be considered a stamp or a sheet of stamps) comprising a visible first indicia (12) identifying document as being a limited edition (Col.5, lines 47-50), a second indicia (16) made using ink that can be seen when viewed under UV or infrared light (Col. 9, lines 19-24), not visible under normal viewing conditions (Col. 6, lines 15-23) and incapable of being scanned for reproduction (Col. 8, lines 63-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3722

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 13, 19-22, 24, 30-33, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gasper et al.

Gasper et al discloses a document (which can be a stamp or sheet of stamps) comprising all the elements as claimed in Claims 12 and 23, and as set forth above. However, Gasper et al does not disclose: a first indicia being a unique ID which identifies that said limited edition stamp is one out of a predetermined limited number; a third indicia for identifying the printer or location of where the stamp was printed, wherein the third indicia is not visible under normal viewing conditions, incapable of being scanned for reproduction, and wherein the ink can be viewed under UV or infrared light.

In regards to Claims 13, 19, 24 and 30, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to place any desirable indicia on the stamp document, since it would only depend on the intended use of the assembly and the desired information to be displayed. Further, it has been held that when the claimed printed matter is not functionally related to the substrate it will not distinguish the invention from the prior art in terms of patentability. *In re Gulack* 217 USPQ 401, (CAFC 1983). Also, in the present case, there appears to be no new or unobvious structural relationship between the printed matter and the substrate.

Art Unit: 3722

6. In regards to Claims 19-22 and 30-33, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include as many types of indica having characteristics as the "second indicia" as desired, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., 193 USPQ 8.

### Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 15 and 26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

## Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 12-15, 18-26 and 29-33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 3722

#### **Contact Information**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark T. Henderson whose telephone number is (703)305-0189. The examiner can be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:30 AM to 3:45 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner supervisor, A. L. Wellington, can be reached on (703) 308-2159. The fax number for TC 3700 is (703)-872-9302. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 3700 receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-1148.

MTH

February 5, 2002

A. L. WELLINGTON/
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700